HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIV, No. 14 Saturday, April 6, 1957 Washington, D. C.

LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

Bulletin on the Budget: To the minor obligato of Ike's deprecating statements about spending reduction, the great effort to cut the Budget forges on — albeit in the face of growing difficulties. Impatient economy advocates out in the constituencies write in and ask a lot of questions about these roadblocks and how to surmount them. Questions being asked, together with answers that HUMAN EVENTS has been able to obtain, are as follows:

(1) *Why not just impose a flat ten or twenty per cent cut across the board?*

Because (among other reasons) a lot of members of Congress are allergic to the criticism propagated by the White House that this would constitute just a crude "meat-ax" approach to a problem touching national security and welfare and so forth. (Maybe your local paper has a "liberal" editorialist who sings this tune.) Actually, most Congressmen think (since they know from personal observation in Washington a great deal about "the care and feeding of bureaucrats") that the across-the-board cut would be good; would make divisional bureaucrats cut down on the swollen, lazy staffs under them who waste the public money.

(2) *Why is the fight slowing down?*

Because Representative Fogarty, a Democratic New Deal wheel horse (probably operating under orders from the New Dealish Speaker Rayburn) is deliberately retarding the legislative processes, insisting on the piecemeal method of considering item by item, with debate and time-consuming discussion on the floor. Reportedly, he hopes to give the "special interests" in each constituency a chance to hammer their economy-minded Congressman into submission — to eliminate or modify cuts. Then when the bill goes over to the Senate, that body will modify these cuts further or drop them entirely. That's the strategy.

(3) *Is the House stronger for cuts than the Senate?*

Yes. Congresswoman St. George (R.-N.Y.) this week expressed a common verdict when she referred, in her newsletter, to the Senate: "That is where the big spenders live and breathe." Mrs. St. George gave a chart analytically comparing appropriation bills in House and Senate in the past eight years — every year showing the Senate upping the amount passed by the House.

(4) *Why is this?*

The House is more sensitive to public sentiment; every member has to face election every two years. In the Senate, only one-third are up for re-election every two years.

(5) *Does that show up today in the economy fight?*

Sure does. Last week, the Senate leadership tried to slip over a $1.5 billion pork barrel bill, craftily designed to give every state a bite out of the Treasury for special interests. Senator Byrd jumped up and denounced it on the floor of the Senate and temporarily delayed consideration.

(6) *What can be done by the average citizen to stop this sort of thing and to help cut the Budget?*

Keep writing your Representative, but put more steam into your letters to your Senator (and of course to the White House, which needs it more than ever).

(7) *How about a national organization to spur economy?*

There has been an effort here to start something like that.

But the "fat cats" approached for financing the matter became frightened and turned it down. They were afraid that they would lose access to the White House — that the Palace Guard would retaliate — if it became known that they were involved. Even an attempt by economy-minded Senators to get contributions to underwrite a corps of appropriations specialists (technicians who know how to redraft subsections and to use the pencil) failed for the same reason. Sad — but true.

(8) *Isn't that a serious mistake?*

Yes, old hands in the Capital say it is. Sentiment for cutting continues strong — actually is increasing — but it may fritter away. Experience shows that. The uproar over MacArthur's dismissal in 1951 (Congressmen today compare that phenomenon with the present demand for economy) followed that course. No organization kept the sentiment going and gave it direction, and Republicans began to split and wrangle as between MacArthur and Taft for the upcoming Presidential nomination. At the time, HUMAN EVENTS warned that something of the sort might happen. It requires no great prescience by an observer on the spot to see this, then or now.

(9) *What's the answer today?*

The "fat cats" mentioned were very big boys indeed. Now, perhaps important but less prominent and vulnerable figures may arise to back another attempt. Or perhaps the only way is for leaders in

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

each community to organize and give vent to the popular will. Better do it — is the advice from Capitol Hill; this is the first time in 25 years that the mass of the people are aroused about our fiscal situation. Take advantage of it now.

Friend of Labor Bosses: Conservative Republicans on Capitol Hill are blaming Secretary of Labor James Mitchell for letting the Democrats "grab the ball" of union corruption (for example, in the case of Beck) and run with it, as the Committee led by Democratic Senator McClellan has been doing so brilliantly. These Republicans point out that Mitchell has been head of the Department of Labor for over three years and as such he possessed full powers to go into the way union officials misuse union funds; that the Department of Labor was supposed to gather full figures and data on such matters, and what McClellan has unearthed could easily have been brought to public attention by the present Secretary of Labor.

GOP anger increases as Republicans canvass sentiment on the Beck affair in the Congressional districts. They estimate that, if the exposé of Beck had occurred before the last election, they would have doubled or greatly increased their margins over the Democratic opponents — so strong is the sentiment at home against friends and allies of unions today. Indeed, it now appears that close contests lost by Republicans in last fall's elections might have been won — if Mitchell had done his duty and exposed labor racketeering — and the GOP would have won Congress.

These Republicans, of course, concede that Mitchell has been no worse an offender as Secretary of Labor than were his Democratic predecessors under Truman and Roosevelt. But that, in their eyes, is faint excuse. The fact is that Mitchell is regarded by most Republicans here as a fundamentally pro-labor boss official, following as closely to the unions' "line" on legislation and kindred matters as he dares (in a cabinet that contains Humphrey and Weeks) — but he is nevertheless, in effect, a friend of the dictators of organized labor.

One story is often related, concerning the late General B. B. Somervell's opinion of Mitchell. The General was once WPA Administrator under Roosevelt and Harry Hopkins and generally was classified as a New Dealer. This radicalism wore off to a certain extent after he became president of Koppers, Inc., but his viewpoint was that of a friend of the New Dealers. Somervell, after a luncheon with Mitchell a few years ago, remarked: "It's appalling how prejudiced Jim is on the side of organized labor. He takes their point of view on all sorts of questions."

Bureaucratic Blackmail: Washington observers noted the typical bureaucratic response (reminiscent of similar capers under the New and Fair Deals) to a House cut of $58,000,000 in the Post Office budget.

The House appropriated $3.2 billion, yet the Post Office (which has more than 500,000 employees) instantly insisted that a cut of $58,000,000 — only 1.7 per cent — would have to be selected from a choice of the following:

Dropping all Saturday mail deliveries — which, the Department said tearfully, would cost 12,000 persons their jobs and save $53,000,000.

Delivering only first class mail on Saturday — saving $10,000,000.

Holding city business sections deliveries to two daily — saving $5,000,000.

Stopping sales of money orders — saving $15,000,000.

Holding mail routes at current levels despite mushrooming city growth — saving $10,000,000.

In other words, the Department would cut the $58,000,000 where it would cause the greatest public squawks — all this in order to force Congress to reinstate the cuts.

Another piece of bureaucratic sabotage was demonstrated last week. The Post Office did not distribute the money appropriated last year over the full year (which ends June 30) but comes up to the last month — June — with a deficiency of $47,000,000.

The Department now tells Congress that a supplemental appropriation of that amount must be immediately passed; otherwise, enough employees will have to be laid off during June to bring expenditures in line with appropriations. Since that procedure would mean a 30-day nation-wide postal paralysis, Congress is put on the spot.

Experienced Capital observers believe that many of the cuts being made by Congress today will be similarly sabotaged; that there is a secret concerted plan to do so. This trickery became standard operating procedure during the Roosevelt and Truman regimes. Those administrations sought to get credit for economical appropriations at Budget time, and then got supplemental appropriations when the public attention was elsewhere.

Such bureaucratic dishonesty did not occur before 1933 when any bureau chief who engaged in it knew he would be instantly dismissed.

Again and again today — veteran observers remark — the GOP Administration is duplicating the fiscal evils of the Democratic regimes which preceded it.

Byrd: The Senator from Virginia, who has led the economy forces in Congress for many years, is not — as many Northern papers picture him — just a penny-pinching zealot. He is — say colleagues — a great constitutionalist whose loyalty to the intent of the Founding Fathers has cast him, in this climactic stage of his career, as the arch anti-spender in Congress.

Virginians point out that, in 1928, when Byrd was Governor of the state, he sponsored and got passed what today might be called a "civil rights" bill, but which was then known as an "anti-lynching" bill.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There have been no lynchings since that year in Virginia. Nor have there been any more than negligible incidents of civil disturbances or labor terrorism — for the bill prohibited any group of people from doing violence to any individual. Under this law, labor goons seeking to intimidate non-strikers and non-union workers can be and have been prosecuted. Consequently, there has been precious little of what is know as "labor violence" in Virginia in recent years.

Finally, Harry Byrd, author of an "anti-lynching" bill in a Southern state, is also a strong opponent of the Supreme Court decision in favor of desegregation, and a supporter of the doctrine of "interposition," to protect the sovereignty of the states against Federal encroachment.

Former Governor Tuck of Virginia (now a member of Congress from that state) pays this tribute to Byrd: "The conservator of our fiscal soundness and monetary integrity is also the conservator of our constitutional liberties."

ADA: The ultra-liberal Americans for Democratic Action, meeting here in national convention, this week went on record as feeling that there are some good things about President Eisenhower, after all — such as his Budget for the coming year. The one fly it found in the Budget ointment was that, on some points, Eisenhower should have proposed spending more money.

True to its tradition, ADA also went on record as favoring policies looking ultimately toward recognition of Red China. (Some observers see more than coincidence in the timing of this action to dovetail with publication in *Look* Magazine of a report by its correspondent, William Stevens — one of the trio of American newsmen who visited Communist China despite State Department disapproval — painting a highly favorable picture of the industrial development of that country and denying that it is in any way a satellite of Moscow.)

Other observers note cynically the name of Maryland's "ultra-modern Republican" Governor Theodore R. McKeldin as featured speaker at the convention's main banquet. The thesis of his address was that with "liberals" on alert guard, it is no longer possible for corrupt political machines to develop and thrive.

Noting the widespread tolerance of gambling and illegal liquor trafficking in many parts of MeKeldin's home state, plus his obvious willingness to play political ball with highly suspect Democratic leaders, one onlooker appends this description to the affair: "Slot machine liberalism."

Not a word was said during the convention about the involvement of ADA's retiring national chairman, Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., in the notorious Paul Hughes case, in which Rauh and certain other "liberals" sought to buy from Hughes what they thought were secret documents from the files of the McCarthy investigating committee. Rather than do anything to repudiate Rauh in any way, the organization re-elected him to its national Executive Committee.

Education Front: Early last year, Congress authorized creation of a "President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School," to survey the nation's colleges, universities and adult education programs and recommend steps for their improvement and expansion, to handle an anticipated flood of new students in the next few years.

As requested by the Administration, $150,000 was appropriated for the job; that was to do the whole thing, including preparation of the report which is to be submitted by December 31 next.

However, when Members of Congress began studying the fine print deep in the 1,165-page book containing the President's Budget estimates for the coming year, it developed that $150,000 did not do the whole thing.

These estimates contained three new items for this "President's Committee, etc." Items:

$300,000 for the committee to complete its report.

$650,000 for grants to states "to establish state committees which will consider and stimulate action on problems of education beyond the high school." (Cloakroom translation: to lobby for a Federal Aid to Colleges program.)

$2,500,000 "to assist the states in developing programs to meet increases in enrollment in institutions of higher learning and to implement recommendations of the President's Committee. . . ." This seems to presuppose recommendations for some sort of expansion program.

Altogether, a total of $3,600,000 — exactly 24 times the initial request.

This week, the House took a look at the first of the new requests. Its Appropriations Committee had cut the report-completion item to $200,000; the House, in economizing mood, cut out the entire fund.

Profile of Courage: Although his firm is known to enjoy big Government contracts and subcontracts, Admiral Ben Moreell, Chairman of the Board of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation, draws attention to "profligate Government spending" in his annual report just out, and points out that such spending "requires onerous taxation, which in turn, creates disincentives to increased production. This results in diminished tax collections and, thereafter, the inevitable disastrous inflationary effects which come about when Government seeks to 'prime the pump' by pouring money and credit into the economic blood stream of the nation, with no offsetting increases in goods and services available for purchases. History shows that at such times those who control the Government are tempted to divert attention from domestic difficulties by seeking foreign adventures, frequently leading to war."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Campaign Expenses: In a Senate speech last week, Senator Andrew F. Schoeppel (R.-Kan.) assailed "the Gore Report" on 1956 campaign expenditures. In a long and detailed analysis, Schoeppel exposed glaring inconsistencies appearing in that document, citing such errors as: omission of a loan by David Dubinsky — amounting to $25,000 — from the total loans received by Democrats; omission of Adlai Stevenson's name from the list of "$5,000 and over" contributors, although he had contributed $6,000 to the Democrats; omission of heavy Democratic contributors from the list of contributions from airline company officials; similar errors in the listings for underwriters' firms, "Twelve Selected Families," advertising agencies, and so forth.

Schoeppel also pointed out that the Gore report disguised the extent of labor union activity in last fall's election. "There can be no question," he stated, "from the subcommittee's own figures, that the expenditures by labor in the last campaign exceed $3 million, rather than the $941,271 set forth on page 2 of the subcommittee's report." He concluded: "In view of the publicity the report received at the time it was issued, and the great public expense involved in its preparation, the majority members of the subcommittee have an obligation to the Senate to explain how these errors occurred."

The Guilty Nations: The "liberal" thesis of the "good and bad nations," which cast Germany and Japan as the principal "villains" of World War II, is no longer all-powerful in the Capital. Continuing disclosures of Roosevelt's pre-Pearl Harbor machinations (see "But Where's the Iceberg?" by George Morgenstern, below), together with other voluminous researches of "revisionist" historians (Beard, Tansill, Chamberlin, Sanborn) are felt to be influential in this gradual change of climate.

The latest indication that the "guilty nation" theory is at last on the wane is the renewed attempt of Senators Everett Dirksen (R.-Ill.) and Olin Johnston (D.-S.C.) to secure the return of enemy assets seized during World War II.

Twelve years after the end of the war, in violation of international law, the United States still holds property taken from German and Japanese nationals. This, it is felt, amounts to confiscation — a continuation of the "woe to the vanquished" policies followed by Roosevelt and Stalin.

Now, a bill introduced by Senator Johnston would require the Government to return the seized property, or — if it has been sold — the cash equivalent. One key property involved in the dispute, the General Aniline and Film Corporation, is valued at $110,000,000.

But Where's the Iceberg? *Day of Infamy*, by Walter Lord, 218 pages, $3.95 (Henry Holt and Co.)

by George Morgenstern

author of *Pearl Harbor, The Story of the Secret War* (1947), most authoritative book on the subject.

Mr. Lord achieved a success with the account of another marine tragedy, the sinking of the Titanic; so it is natural that he should apply the same panorama technique to a bigger and better disaster — the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941.

Mr. Lord is an incuriously curious, or curiously incurious, investigator. He has read a good deal of the record, which is unfamiliar to all but a few specialists, and says he has interviewed some hundreds of participants in the engagements, most of them American, but a few Japanese. His book presents "the human drama" of what men on both sides did and thought.

In *A Night to Remember*, Mr. Lord was able to rely on a convenient iceberg to sink the Titanic. Icebergs have no motive. At Pearl Harbor, the ships that went down and the men who were killed were dispatched by other men as agents of state policy. Mr. Lord never gets close to telling why. His book, accordingly, has strictly a one-dimensional effect. We don't have even as much as an iceberg to explain why everything happened.

It is a striking achievement to write a whole book about Pearl Harbor without ever mentioning Hitler, Stalin, Churchill, the war in Europe, and the Atlantic conference; without mentioning Tojo, Chiang Kai-shek, the "China Incident," or Ambassadors Grew, Nomura, or Kurusu; without a reference to Secretary of State Hull, Secretary of War Stimson, Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles, General Gerow, Colonel Bedell Smith, Admiral J. O. Richardson, Captain John Creighton, Captain Laurance Safford, Commander Schulz, and others, whose stories are vital to understanding. President Roosevelt, Secretary of the Navy Knox, General Marshall, Army Chief of Staff, and Admiral Stark, Chief of Naval Operations, all key figures in a sinister cabal, are dismissed with casual and almost irrelevant reference.

If Mr. Lord ever heard that the United States had cracked the Japanese ultra-secret code as early as August, 1940, and that high officials knew Japan's intentions almost as well as Tokyo did, he keeps it under his hat. If he knows that Washington, London, Cavite, and Panama all had code machines with which to intercept Japan's messages, but Pearl Harbor, oddly, did not, he doesn't mention it. Nor does he explore the strangely ambiguous "warnings" sent by Washington to Pearl Harbor.

He doesn't say that Mr. Roosevelt, the night before the attack, read a Japanese intercept and remarked, "This means war," but gave his Chief of Naval Operations to understand that that was not "anything that required action." Nor does he refer to Secretary Stimson's succinct expression of the Roosevelt administration's general intention: "The question was how we should maneuver them [the Japanese] into the position of firing the first shot without allowing too much danger to ourselves."

Mr. Roosevelt's devious maneuvers are the missing iceberg in the Pearl Harbor story. As with all icebergs, his was about one-quarter visible and three-quarters obscured. Thus, when the President came to proclaim to Congress "a date which will live in infamy," Mr. Lord implies his approval of a moral judgment against the Japanese, but he has no judgment on a Presidential policy of deceit and betrayal which dragged a hesitant people to war at an initial sacrifice of 2,400 lives.

Good little boys are incurious about such matters and get their books chosen by the Book-of-the-Month Club. They receive critical acclaim from all right thinkers. Mr. Lord's book should make quite a wad.

Letter from CHARLES K. McWHORTER, Chairman, Young Republican National Federation: "It is impossible for young people to be politically well informed unless they read about all sides of important issues. In this respect, I find my weekly reading of HUMAN EVENTS invaluable."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $12 a year, by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.

Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. Only 1955 and 1956 Volumes are available.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*

JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*

Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1957.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIV, No. 14 HUMAN EVENTS April 6, 1957

Article Section I

WE *CAN* CUT TAXES
IF WE CUT THE BUDGET

By SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD
Democrat of Virginia

I TOOK MY OATH of office with President Roosevelt, March 4, 1933.

Mr. Roosevelt was elected on an economy platform. He accused Mr. Hoover of being a spendthrift and throwing discretion to the winds. This "spendthrift," Hoover, was then spending less than $4 billion a year and was the only President in our history to leave office with less Federal employees than when he came in.

The first bill I voted on as a Senator was titled "a bill to preserve the credit of the United States Government."

Mr. Roosevelt had promised a reduction of 25 per cent. His bill provided for a reduction of 15 per cent — a fair performance as political pledges go.

Within six months Mr. Roosevelt changed his course and began an orgy of Federal spending which has continued to this day under both Democratic and Republican administrations.

In 25 years the Federal debt has risen from $22 billion to more than $275 billion. It is taking more than ten per cent of our total tax income to pay the interest.

In the first 150 years — up to 1932 — we were practically on a pay-as-you-go basis. We had our wars and buckled down and paid off the cost. These years may be ridiculed by some as the horse-and-buggy days, but they were the days of frugality, thrift, and work.

It was that period that makes possible our prosperity of today.

We have increased the Federal civilian payroll from 575,000 to 2½ million employees, and increased their pay from less than $1 billion 25 years ago to more than $10 billion yearly. This huge Federal employment is an index of big Federal Government and the concentration of power in Washington.

In 1956 the gross tax collection — Federal, state, and local — was $99.8 billion out of a national income of $334 billion. This means that 29 cents out of every dollar earned goes for taxes, one kind or another. This is an increase of $10 billion in the collection of all taxes over the year 1955.

WHEN WE SPEAK of taxation we think mainly in terms of Federal taxation, because it is consolidated under one Government. The fact is, however, that there are more than 116,000 governmental units in the United States — 3,000 counties, 16,000 principalities, 17,000 townships, and 79,000 school and special districts, many of which have the power to levy taxes. These state and local taxes have been increased by leaps and bounds.

How long can we continue to tax and tax and spend and spend and at the same time continue our progress and preserve our solvency?

As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I am convinced that the time is overdue for substantial tax reduction. But I could not support any tax reduction unless the expenses of Government are reduced to a level which would make tax reduction possible on a sound basis. I know of no more certain road to financial suicide than to reduce taxes and thereby create deficits and debt. It is up to the people themselves. If the pending Budget is substantially reduced, a tax reduction should follow.

I agree with the very able Secretary of the Treasury, George Humphrey, for whom I have the highest regard. His abilities are pre-eminent. He has said that expenses should, and must, be reduced and that a continuance of high spending will bring about a depression that will "make your hair curl." This, of course, assumes that the Federal Government has left us enough hair to curl.

I agree with the Hoover report that many billions can be saved. Mr. Hoover estimated 5½ billions.

If citizens want to reduce taxes, to reduce Federal spending to allow a tax reduction, they must demand it constantly. Their demands must be specific and forceful. Citizens can appear before Congress more often than they do in order to take an active position against specific spending. Again and again streams of persons appear before congressional committees requesting money. Few indeed are those who appear in opposition to spending money. Citizens must think of Federal spending in terms of the national interest and stop pushing spending programs of local interest

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and those of the spending lobbies. All of us must sacrifice something in the difficult days ahead. We must stop asking the Federal Government for things we should do for ourselves.*

The regular Budget just presented to the Senate provides for $3 billion more of spending than the previous year. It is somewhat paradoxical that the President stated his opposition to inflation, yet the only way this $3 billion of additional revenues will come to the Treasury is by inflation. It is unsound, in my judgment, to predicate a Budget upon an anticipated increase in revenue from an existing tax base.

When the effort is made to reduce Federal spending, we are always told that such reduction cannot be made without disastrous results.

Just to mention two of the new proposals in this Budget:

Why, for example, should the Federal Government embark upon the $2 billion local school construction program and the health insurance program proposed in the Budget now pending? This will open up a Pandora's box of Federal spending.

Spending programs start as mice and quickly grow into the size of elephants. In the 1958 budget there are 18 new state-aid programs, making 78 in all.

A COMPARISON OF expenditures in fiscal 1954 and fiscal 1958 is discouraging. In fiscal 1958 we will spend $2 billion less than in fiscal 1954 on the military, but we will spend approximately $7 billion more in domestic, civilian expenditures. The veteran's expenditures have gone up $700 million, labor and welfare $1 billion, agriculture $2.5 billion — about double — and so on down the line.

In 1932 the Federal Government expended $250 million for so-called grants to the states. It is now spending over $3½ billion in more than 78 grant programs. Of course, reduction in expenditures is difficult, if not impossible, if we assume that such Federal appropriations as these and others of like character are a part of the true obligations of the Federal Government.

Take foreign economic aid. The Marshall Plan had a four-year limitation, and under it $15 billion was expended. I voted for it in the years just after World War II, because at that time there was need for this economic aid. But then, after the expiration of the Marshall plan, we have spent over $40 billion more in additional foreign aid. This year the Congress is requested to increase the foreign economic aid appropriation and to open up a vast new area for such spending.

It is time for the American people to realize that, while we have great potentialities of wealth, there is a limit beyond which we cannot go. We must realize that creeping paternalism of the Federal Government is just as bad as creeping socialism. The end result is the same — the destruction of the principles of our free society.

There is one principle we must always preserve if our democracy is to survive: "It is the duty of the people to support the Government and not the Government the people."

Today 37,817,000 citizens are receiving payments from the Federal Government. We are approaching the danger zone. If we consider the dependents involved, it is possible that more than half of our population is affected by regular Federal payments.

The very base of all we have in free government is our fiscal solvency. Without it we cannot preserve our representative democracy. Without it we cannot have military preparedness except under totalitarian methods such as those in Russia. Without the solvency of the American Government, we would enter the age of international darkness. Ours is the only currency in which everyone everywhere in the world has confidence.

Our free enterprise system is the greatest deterrent in the world today to Russian aggression. It is the system that, within a relatively short span of 170 years, has brought us from the impotency of 13 divided colonies to our present position of world leadership. It has enabled us, with only six per cent of the world population, to outproduce the rest of the world combined.

There is literally nothing on earth more important than the preservation of the fiscal integrity of the Federal Government of the United States of America and the freedoms upon which our Republic is founded.

Let us pledge to ourselves that these freedoms shall be preserved so that the future generations of Americans can live as we have, in the security of our constitutional democracy.

These words were written by Senator Byrd in February of this year. Since then, of course, the people have been doing exactly as he advised, flooding Congress with mail in protest against the $72 billion Budget.

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15¢ (coins, not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½¢ per copy; for airmail, add 1¢ per copy.

Prices of 4-page articles or news sections are as follows: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIV, No. 14 HUMAN EVENTS April 6, 1957

Article Section II

What Price Coattails?

By HANDICAPPER

IF THE HANDICAPPERS at the nation's race tracks were as blandly indifferent to the way horses run as our "liberal" handicappers are to the past performances of politicians, the wagering public would be in a sadder state of unenlightenment than it now is.

Although followers of the Turf make a lot of cockeyed mistakes, such as betting on horses with the same name as a brother-in-law, most of them do rely on form sheets for the facts on what the contending horses have done before they got into the race just coming up. But in politics the handicappers first pick a theory of what statesmen ought to do, one that best fits the bad predictions they have made in the past, and then make their view of what is going to happen gibe with the theory.

Think of the confusion at Belmont Park if the *Morning Telegraph* charts figured a race the way Stewart Alsop — of the team of Alsop Brothers which has been touting suckers onto false favorites for years — figured a set of 1956 Senatorial races. Wrote Stew: "Although the hearts of men like Dirksen of Illinois, Capehart of Indiana, or Butler of Maryland may still belong to Taft, they rode back into the Senate on the coattails of Dwight D. Eisenhower." Maybe the three solons mentioned thought they were riding on Ike's coattails when, during the campaign, they "swore undying allegiance and support to the owner of the coattails"; but on the morning of Wednesday, November 7, they must have wondered whether riding on Ike's coattails, even with the fingers crossed, was really necessary.

The returns showed that coattail riders from Coast to Coast, candidates who were sincere "modern Republicans" with no "lunatic fringe" (Alsop's phrase) background, had run out of the money. Duff, Thornton, Langlie, McKay, Bender: all convinced coattail riders, and all up the track! The more astute politicians twigged in a week or two, but here it is spring, and brilliant, witty and pontifical Alsops haven't found out what happened last November.

To be sure, Stew has discovered that "most Republicans have been receiving remarkably heavy mail taking the Knowland line on foreign policy and also bitterly attacking the Eisenhower Budget"; and he reports that "in the cloakrooms the phrase 'New Republicanism' is beginning to be spat out with the same distaste reserved for the phrase 'New Deal' among conservative Democrats in the 1930's."

But does he imagine these reactions are so recent or insignificant as not to be reflected in the election returns four months ago? Perhaps he does, because the Alsops seldom seem to understand what the lower orders of men are thinking. It was Brother Joe who in 1950 toured Ohio and reported that Bob Taft, who was running for re-election to the Senate, would probably lose, or at best squeak through by 1500 votes. The Senator took it by nearly half a million! All I have to say is that a few comparable jobs like that in the Daily Racing Form and somebody would plant a bomb in the front office.

HAVING WORN OUT my arterial tension on photo finishes and other hazards these many years, I am passing up Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.'s *Crisis of the Old Order* (Houghton, Mifflin) although I gather from the reviewers that a "zombie" like me, who was around at the time, could hardly distinguish the pre-New Deal scene from Rome under the Emperor Caligula. "Liberal" historians, like their allies in journalism, could profit from the disciplines of the racing papers. If a horse ran third but was gaining at the end, the chart has to show it. The chronicler of the Roosevelt Era, however, is seldom troubled by the fact that New Deal was faltering under the bat and would probably have collapsed altogether without the use of an unfair electric battery under his girth — World War II.

Nor do these evangelized writers ever suggest that little was accomplished by the New Deal — aside from smashing the gold dollar and transferring control of the workers from the straw bosses to the union goons — that wouldn't in all probability have come about anyway, had the Old Order been given a competent hand ride! This, incidentally, is "myth" to Professor Henry Steele Commager, another pundit whom I advise laying off if you don't want to be touted onto a stiff.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Perhaps all this is too far in the past to interest anybody today, although misreading of the past undoubtedly explains the adoption of the New Deal by the "modernized" Republican party. Surely the explanation of this extraordinary situation must be bad handicapping by political leaders, because the voters have been trying to dump the New Deal into the ashcan for years. That a suspicion of this may have begun to trickle up to the high command is suggested by a recent statement by the new chairman of the Republican National Committee, H. Meade Alcorn. Said he: "In his day, Senator Taft was a modern Republican."

If it wasn't for that phrase "in his day" I could go along with Mr. Alcorn, because, as things are turning out, Bob Taft was a lot more "modern" than those creatures of public relations, our officially "modern Republicans." Senator Taft foresaw the futility of foreign aid as a means of making friends abroad, and he was aware of the peril of inflation if Government spending was not cut down to size. Many of Alcorn's "modern Republicans," in the ranks and in Congress, agree with Taft on at least those two points rather than with their "modern" leaders. So perhaps after all Taft doesn't have to be kissed off as something like the Model-T Ford or Man o'War, all well enough "in their day." It is a day that millions are nostalgically trying to get back to.

When was Senator Taft's "day," which Meade Alcorn seems to imply was about the time of the Tweed Ring scandals or the Whisky Rebellion? Actually Taft died on July 8, 1953, at the age of 63, or one year older than Eisenhower. Had he lived, he would be 67 years old, and we can be sure that he would be smiling quietly to himself as the labor goons before the Select Senate Committee vindicated his efforts, through the Taft-Hartley Law, to discourage criminal practices by labor's "leaders." He would be feeling fine about other developments, too.

Indeed, Taft's day was also Eisenhower's day. With Taft's wise advice available, the President was at top form. With Taft still around, Ike might have been dissuaded from that fateful trip to the Summit conference at Geneva, from which so much misunderstanding and false diagnosis have resulted. And certainly Taft would have put in an oar to curb the determination of the Palace Guard to split the GOP down the middle without any clear definition of what the rift was about. I don't imagine Bob Taft was ever at a race track in his life, but he knew instinctively what horse players knew from experience, that it's a poor trainer who drugs his own horse.

NOR WOULD HE have misjudged what was going on, as President John Adams declared his Federalist party had misjudged things in 1801. As quoted in that cogent historical study, John Dos Passos' *The Men Who Made the Nation* (Doubleday), Adams wrote after the triumph of Jefferson: "No party that ever existed knew itself so little, or so vainly overestimated its Influence and Popularity as ours. None understood so ill the Causes of its own Power or so wantonly destroyed them. If we had been blessed with Common Sense we should not have been overthrown by Philip Freneau, Duane, Callender, Cooper and Lyon; or their great Patron and Protector" — these latter being the liberal columnists and Committeemen for an Effective Congress of their day.

Of course, the Republican party hasn't lost anything but Congress since 1952, and none of its leaders is muttering discontent comparable to John Adams' jeremiad, unless in private. But Senator Knowland's decision to retire from the Senate next year, in all probability to improve his chances for the GOP Presidential nomination in 1960, makes it look as if some smart politicians weren't relying exclusively on the "modern" columnists to figure the odds for them. By 1960 the Citizens for Eisenhower will have gone back to their international banking houses and women's clubs. Politics will be back in the hands of the pros. These gentry have their faults, but they do understand past performance charts, and are quick to detect an overlay. To us unredeemed improvers of the breed of the thoroughbred horse, this intrusion of realism into a field so long confused by bright Alsopian lauguage will come as a breath of fresh air.

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15¢ (coins, not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½¢ per copy; for airmail, add 1¢ per copy.

Prices of 4-page articles or news sections are as follows: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand.

"Handicapper," a frequent HUMAN EVENTS contributor, is an editor of one of America's largest circulation publications.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED